UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,206	11/03/2003	Barton J. Milburn	FORE-105	4180
Ansel M. Schwa	7590 04/23/200 artz	EXAMINER		
Suite 304	waat.		NGUYEN, STEVEN H D	
201 N. Craig Street Pittsburgh, PA 15213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2619	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/700,206	MILBURN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	STEVEN H.D NGUYEN	2619					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.076	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 14 April 2008. A brief in date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	ny extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3)	7(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.				
		90 Ch Can - d h -					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		impliant Americanient (i	101-324).				
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
	101						
	/Steven H.D Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2619					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant states that Barke does not disclose a non-modifiable output (a connect will be destroyed and create a new one when the QOS of the connection is modified). In reply, Barke discloses a outlink to a user such link 16, receiving a modified QOS, it will destroy the old connection and create a new one with the modified QOS as stated by RSVP allows receivers to change their QoS reservations at any time even after a multicast session has been established. It is somewhat difficult to support dynamic QoS in ATM networks, however, since neither UNI 4.0 nor PNNI currently supports changing QoS parameters once a VC has been established. The only possible way to change QoS for an existing data VC in the ATM network is to establish a new VC with the modified QoS parameters and migrate traffic from the old VC to the new one. For a sufficiently large multicast tree, such changes can be quite costly since many of the requested QoS changes will propagate beyond the LIS of the receiver that requested the QoS change. In the inventive scheme, which has separate VCs for intra and inter LIS traffic, most requests for changing QoS can be accommodated locally, i.e. within the LIS of the host that requested the change, because the inter LIS data VC for a given data flow is established with a sufficiently large QoS so that it can accommodate a whole range of QoS requests from individual receivers. Requests for changes in QoS by local receivers may thus cause establishment of additional VCs (and possibly removal of old VCs) to support the new QoS but such changes will be limited to the LIS.